

REMARKS

As a result of the foregoing amendment, claims 11 and 13 have been cancelled. New Claim 14 has been added and Claim 12 has been amended to be dependent thereon.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 are requested. It is believed that new Claim 14 is not subject to this rejection and accordingly the rejection should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being and patentable over Baer et al.' 085 in view of the Schutze et al. article in Nature Biotechnology are requested. The Examiner asserts that Baer et al. discloses a laser capture microdissection apparatus comprising a transfer film carrier having a substrate surface and a laser capture a microdissection transfer film coupled to said substrate surface of the transfer film carrier. The Examiner recognizes that Baer et al. does not expressly disclose the thickness range from 3 to 6 μm and indicates that it is advantageous for the transfer film to have a thickness of 50 μm but discloses that it can be of a greater thickness. The reference further indicates that the thickness of this film can be less than 50 μm .

However, there is absolutely nothing in this reference which suggests an extremely thin film with a thickness of 3 to 6 μm . The thickness is disclosed and suggested in Baer et al. are so much greater than the range recited in the present claims as to be completely non-suggestive of such a range.

The Examiner's attention is directed to Table 1 of Example 21 page 12 of the present application. In the examples of the present invention where a yellow aramid film is used, and a thickness of the film is between 3.9 and 4.2 μ , the properties of improved adhesion to a glass slide, improved micro dissection suitability, and improve cutting sharpness can be simultaneously achieved. In contrast to the presently claimed invention, the data regarding the Control Examples clearly demonstrate that when the thickness is 1 μm or 7.5 μm , at least one of the aforementioned properties of improved adhesion to a glass slide, improved microdissection suitability and improved cutting sharpness is lost. Nothing in Baer et al. suggest this unexpected advantage by using a film having a thickness substantially less than any contemplated in Baer et al.


In addition, Baer et al. does not disclose the use of an aramid film. The Schutze et al. reference add nothing to the disclosure of Baer et al. to make it more relevant to the present invention as claimed. Neither Baer et al. nor Schutze et al. disclose the use of an aramid film. Accordingly, this rejection is untenable and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration and prompt notice of allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 27, 2006

By



Jules E. Goldberg
Reg. No. 24,408
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
REED SMITH LLP
599 Lexington Avenue
29th Floor
New York, NY 10022-7650
(212) 521-5400

JEG:jlw